

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION:

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1 and 2 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 13 and 14 have been added. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 11, 13 and 14 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

In the Office Action, at page 2, claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Okumura et al. (USPN 6,100,633; hereafter, Okumura). This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

The plasma display panel of claim 11 of the present invention comprises a back substrate and barrier ribs. The barrier ribs of the structure of the plasma display panel of claim 11 comprise a bottom structure and an upper structure, and the visible light reflectivity of the regions other than the electrodes is 50% or more when a phosphor is not coated.

It is respectfully submitted that Okumura recites a plasma display panel that has a structure in which the ribs 3 project from the rear substrate 2. Thus, the ribs of Okumura correspond to the upper structure in the plasma display panel of the present claimed invention. However, the bottom structure of the Okumura structure does not correspond to the bottom structure of the present claimed invention.

It is respectfully submitted that the architecture of the bottom structure of claim 11 of the present invention provides strength to the barrier ribs, thus providing a structure of greater mechanical strength than the structure of Okumura.

Also, it should be noted that Okumura recites a "transparent dielectric layer." In contrast, the present claimed invention (see claim 11) utilizes a dielectric layer having a reflectance that enables luminescence of phosphor to be reflected from the back substrate at 50% or more when a phosphor is not coated.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 11 is not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) by Okumura et al. (USPN 6,100,633).

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

In the Office Action, at pages 3-4, claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Asano et al. (USPN 5,909,083; hereafter, Asano) in view of Kawai et al. (USPN 6,199,404; hereafter, Kawai). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1 and 2 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Thus, the rejections of claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are now moot.

NEW CLAIMS:

New claim 13 recites that the features of the present invention include a plasma display panel, comprising: a back substrate having an electrode pattern deposited thereon; and a dielectric layer having barrier ribs formed substantially perpendicular to the dielectric layer, both being formed from ultraviolet-cured and heated barrier rib-forming paste and sintered glass frit, wherein the dielectric layer having barrier ribs is deposited on the back substrate, and wherein a reflectance of the dielectric layer and the barrier ribs enables luminescence of phosphor to be reflected from the back substrate at 50% or more when a phosphor is not coated.

Nothing in the prior art teaches or suggests such. It is submitted that this new claim distinguishes over the prior art.

New claim 14 recites that the features of the present invention include a plasma display panel, comprising: a back substrate having an electrode pattern deposited thereon; and a U shaped dielectric layer-barrier rib structure having barrier ribs formed substantially perpendicular to the dielectric layer, the U shaped structure being formed from ultraviolet-cured and heated barrier rib-forming paste and sintered glass frit and being deposited on the back substrate, wherein a reflectance of the U shaped structure enables luminescence of phosphor to be reflected from the back substrate at 50% or more when a phosphor is not coated.

Nothing in the prior art teaches or suggests such. It is submitted that this new claim distinguishes over the prior art.

CONCLUSION:

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot, and further, that all

Serial No. 10/630,929

Docket No. 1186.1017D

pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: May 24, 2005

By: Darleen J. Stockley
Darleen J. Stockley
Registration No. 34,257

1201 New York Avenue, N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501